

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

INTERVIEW

Applicants appreciate the courtesy extended by the Examiner in a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney. During that interview, certain claim amendments were discussed for putting the application in better condition for allowance over the references currently being relied upon as prior art.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 6, 46, 24 and 64 are objected to and each has been amended to address the Examiner's concerns.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 112

Claims 1-15, 23-33, 41-55, 63-73 and 81-112 are rejected under 35 USC 112 as being indefinite. Each of claims 1, 23, 41, 63, 85, 92, 99 and 106 has been amended, and the rejection of overcome.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC 103

Claims 1-6, 23, 24, 41-46, 63-64, 81-89, 92, 93, 99-103, 106 and 112 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US published application 20030123751 to Krishnamurthy et al. ('751 publication) in view of US patent no. 6792135 to Toyama ('135 patent), in view of US patent 4970663 to Beddell et al. Each of claims 1-6, 23, 24, 41-46, 63-64, 81-89, 92, 93, 99-103, 106 and 112, as now amended, is allowable because no combination of the '751

publication to Krishnamurthy et al., the '135 patent to Toyama, and Beddell et al. teaches or suggests all of the recited limitations.

Claims 7, 11, 25, 29, 47, 51, 65 and 69 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnamurthy et al. (the '751 publication) in view of Toyama and Beddell et al. in further view of US patent 6246779 to Fukui et al. Each of claims 7, 11, 25, 29, 47, 51, 65 and 69, as now amended, is allowable because no combination of the '751 publication to Krishnamurthy et al., Toyama, Beddell et al. and Fukui et al. teaches or suggests all of the recited limitations.

Claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 26, 27, 32, 33, 48, 49, 54, 55, 66, 67, 72, 73, 91, 95, 98, 105, 110 and 111 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnamurthy et al. (the '751 publication) in view of Toyama and Beddell et al. in further view of US published patent application 20030142209 to Yamazaki et al. Each of claims 8, 9, 14, 15, 26, 27, 32, 33, 48, 49, 54, 55, 66, 67, 72, 73, 91, 95, 98, 105, 110 and 111, as now amended, is allowable because no combination of the '751 publication to Krishnamurthy et al., Beddell et al. and Yamazaki et al. teaches or suggests all of the recited limitations.

Claims 10, 12, 13, 28, 30, 31, 50, 52, 53, 68, 70, 71, 97, 108 and 109 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krishnamurthy et al. in view of Beddell et al. in further view of Yamazaki et al. and Fukui et al. Each of claims 10, 12, 13, 28, 30, 31, 50, 52, 53, 68, 70, 71, 97, 108 and 109, as now amended, is allowable because no combination of Krishnamurthy et al., Beddell et al. and Yamazaki et al. teaches or suggests all of the recited limitations.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner's reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/608,784
Amendment dated January 25, 2008
Reply to Office Action mailed December 4, 2007

Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-4399.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 25, 2008 By /Andrew Vernon Smith/
Andrew V. Smith
Reg. No. 43,132
Attorney for Applicant(s)